UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,655	01/05/2006	J. Christopher Anderson	54A-000410US	3991
	7590 08/13/200 LECTUAL PROPERT	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 458			GEBREYESUS, KAGNEW H	
ALAMEDA, CA 94501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/563,655	ANDERSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
KAGNEW H. GEBREYESUS	1656		

	RAGNEW II. GEBRETESUS	1030					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 July 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Futorsians of time may be obtained under 27 CER 1.12(a). The data	f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext							
under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	nally set in the final Offic	e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF AFFEAL 2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CER 41 37 must be f	filed within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed of The Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further col		E below);					
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet 	•	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
appeal; and/or	ter form for appear by materially rec	adoning or simplifying the	ie issues IUI				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	-						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-26</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected. <u>77-20.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13.							
	/ANAND U DESAI/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1656					
	,,,						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant' states that because generic embodiments are added, the search for SEQ ID NO: 1 and 2 should be included. However these sequences are structurally distinct from the sequences originally presented and would pose an undue burden to the examiner. Furthermore claim 17 part (c) includes the limitation "at least about", this limitation is indefinite as the metes and bounds of this term are indefinite. Furthermore with regards to the written description rejection, Applicants argue that the limitation 50% suppressor efficiency to the O-tRNA of SEQ ID NO: 1,2,6,7 and 12 and ORS of SEQ ID NO: 15 or 16. However although the method of elucidating suppressor efficiency for each species of O-tRNA/ORS pair can be used, Applicants are not in possession of the O-tRNA and ORS. Furthermore applicants argue that the limitation of 90% identity is sufficient to describe the genus of O-RS because it is accompanied by a functional limitation. However the specification does not describe any ORS structure with at least about 90% sequence identity to a leucyl O-RS derived from M. thermoautotropicum with any structure and can aminoacylate an O-tRNA with any amino acid (not defined). With regards to the 102(e), regardless of the apparent clerical error, the rejection is sustained because the newly amended claims (e.g. claim 17 (b) and c) encompass O-tRNA sequences that are not defined thus are not compliant with the sequence rules. Furthermore with regards to the 102(e) rejection based on WO2002/086075, Applicants again point to an apparent clerical error with regards to the ORS of SEQ ID NO 65. They state that SEQ ID NO: 65 in WO2002/086075 was misquoted as SEQ ID NO: 66. However regardless of this apparent error Applicants point out that SEQ ID NO: 65 in WO2002/086075 is 100% identical to SEQ ID NO: 15 in the instant application. Therefore the rejection will be sustained.